DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 839 HE 030 825

AUTHOR	Rice, R. Eugene
TITLE	[The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards.]
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1995-01-31
NOTE	27p.
CONTRACT	P116B20191
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Agenda Setting; *Clearinghouses; *College Faculty; Conferences; Coordination; *Diffusion (Communication); Educational Responsibility; Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; *Information Sources; Job Satisfaction; Linking Agents; *Noninstructional Responsibility; Professional Associations; Publications; Research Opportunities; Rewards; Scholarship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards, a project of the American Association for Higher Education, reexamined faculty priorities and reward structures. The Forum sought to assist campuses interested in reexamining faculties' role in teaching, research, and service by addressing three interrelated problems during the three-year grant period: (1) defining roles and activities worthy of faculty time and energy, (2) developing a mechanism for assuring quality performance in these areas, and (3) dealing with bureaucratic forms of accountability and the "productivity agenda." The Forum framed and articulated an agenda; gathered educational leaders in national conferences; and pursued ways to reach a larger audiences. In addition to the national conference, the Forum stimulated smaller meetings, demonstration projects, networking, and publication. The first conference was attended by 564 campus leaders from 42 states and the District of Columbia; the second conference involved 634 participants; the third conference drew 858 participants, including 87 campus teams; conferees represented 14 institutions or systems. Its clearinghouse offers 158 campus documents from 39 states, as well as hundreds of articles; there have been over 800 requests for resources, speakers, and general information. (Contains 40 references). (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 414 839

The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards

Grantee Organization:

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110

Grant Number:

P116B20191

Project Dates:

August 5, 1992 - January 31, 1996

Project Director:

R. Eugene Rice, Scholar in Residence & Director
Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards
American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
Telephone: (202) 293-6440 ext. 37

FIPSE Program Officer(s):

Odus V. Elliott
Preston Forbes

Grant Award:

$220,006.00	Year 1
$192,749.00	Year 2
$142,501.00	Year 3
$ 9,500.00	Extension
$564,756.00	TOTAL

HE 630 P251-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary Paragraph:

AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards set out to provide status, direction, and practical guidance for campuses, especially those with complex missions, interested in reexamining the faculty priorities. The Forum conducts annual national conferences, serves as a resource and a clearinghouse for information on current efforts in relevant areas, publishes monographs on issues related to faculty roles and rewards, and seeds several lines of work, some of which (including "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" and "New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century") have since become full-fledged projects functioning in association with the Forum. With the generous support of FIPSE (in the form of a second three-year grant), the Forum recently began a second phase and will become financially self-supporting by the end of this second grant period.

Contact Names:

R. Eugene Rice, Scholar in Residence and Director
Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards
American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
202-293-6440, ext. 37

Pamela J. Bender, Program Coordinator
Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards and the Teaching Initiative
American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
Washington, DC 20036-1110
202-293-6440, ext. 56

Project Reports & Products:

Diamond, Robert M. and Bronwyn E. Adam, eds. *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty.* (AAHE, 1995).

Lynton, Ernest. *Making the Case for Professional Service.* (AAHE, 1995).

Wergin, Jon F. *The Collaborative Department: How Five Campuses are Inching Toward Cultures of Collective Responsibility.* (AAHE, 1994).

Articles in *Change* and *AAHE Bulletin:*

Altbach, Philip G. and Lionel S. Lewis. "Professorial Attitudes -- An International Survey." (*Change*, November/December 1995).

Burroughs, Catherine B. "Let the Professoriate Flourish." (*AAHE Bulletin*, November 1993).

Bland, Carole J. and Richard L. Holloway. "A Crisis of Mission: Faculty Roles and Rewards in an Era of Health-Care Reform." (*Change*, September/October 1995).

Edgerton, Russell. "From Tenure to...New Pathways." (*AAHE Bulletin*, June 1995).

___. "The Re-examination of Faculty Priorities." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

Fairweather, James S. "Faculty Rewards Reconsidered: The Nature of Tradeoffs." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

Kennedy, Donald. "Another Century's End, Another Revolution for Higher Education." (*Change*, May/June 1995).

Lovett, Clara M. "To Affect Intimately the Lives of the People: American Professors and Their Society." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

___. "A Report from AAHE's First Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards: Great Expectations...And A Call For Help!" (*AAHE Bulletin*, March 1993).

___. "Listening to the Faculty Grapevine." (*AAHE Bulletin*, November 1993).

Marchese, Ted. "It's the System, Stupid." (*Change*, May/June 1995).

Massy, William F. and Andrea K. Wilger. "Improving Productivity: What Faculty Think About It and Its Effect on Quality." (*Change*, July/August, 1995).

Mingle, James R. "Faculty Work and the Costs/Quality/Access Collision." (*AAHE Bulletin*, March 1993).

North, Joan DeGuire. "'Read My Lips:' The Academic Administrator's Role in the Campus Focus on Teaching." (*AAHE Bulletin*, October 1995).

Patrick, Sondra K. "Students on Faculty: Excerpts from a student focus group." (*Change*, November 1993).

Plater, William M. "Future Work: Faculty Time in the 21st Century." (*Change*, May/June 1995).

Portch, Stephen R. "Friends or Foes? One trustee's view of faculty, the rewards system and the balance of power." (*AAHE Bulletin*, November 1993).

Portch, Stephen R., Nancy J. Kaufman, and Jacqueline R. Ross. "From Frog to Prince: From Post-Tenure Review to Faculty Roles, Development, and Rewards." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

Pratt, Anne M. "Public Perceptions, Public Policy: A Conversation with two members of the Virginia General Assembly." (*AAHE Bulletin*, November 1993).

Rosen, Jay. "Public Journalism: A Case for Public Scholarship." (*Change*, May/June 1995).

Scott, David K. and Susan M. Awbrey. "Transforming Scholarship." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

Wachs, Martin. "The Case for Practitioner-Faculty." (*AAHE Bulletin*, November 1993).

Wergin, Jon. "Departmental Awards." (*Change*, July/August 1993).

Reports and Products Generated by Allied Projects:

Breneman, David. *Voluntary Incentives to Forego Tenure*. (AAHE, 1997 - forthcoming).

Byrne, Peter. *Uncoupling Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Chabotar, Kent and James Honan. *New Yardsticks for Financial Distress*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Chait, Richard. *Campuses without Tenure*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

___. *Innovative Modifications of Traditional Tenure Systems*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Chait Richard and Cathy A. Trower. *Practices in Other Professions*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Ferren, Ann. *Senior Faculty Career Transitions: A Developmental & Policy Issue*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Gappa, Judith M. and David W. Leslie. *Academe's Dual Labor Market*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Gappa, Judith M. *Balancing Personal and Professional Lives*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

___. *New Employment Alternatives: Full-Time Nontenure-Track Appointments*. (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Hutchings, Pat. *"From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" A Project Workbook*. (AAHE, 1995)

Licata, Christine M. *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, and Precautions*. (AAHE - 1996 - forthcoming).

Rice, R. Eugene. *Making a Place for the New American Scholar.* (AAHE, 1996).

___. *Heeding New Voices.* (AAHE, 1996 - forthcoming).

Trower, Cathy A. *Tenure Snapshot.* (AAHE, 1996)

Executive Summary

A. Project Overview:

The Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards grew from AAHE's belief that circumstances and fresh ideas had converged to create an unprecedented opportunity to change the way faculty work -- to legitimate a conception of scholarly life and modes of assessing and rewarding scholarly performance that would enable faculty more fully to embrace FIPSE's agenda for better teaching and learning.

Since the start of the grant, the Forum has answered over 800 requests for information, has built a clearinghouse of hundreds of campus documents and articles, and has convened annual conferences. Each conference has exceeded projected attendance figures, with the 1995 conference including 858 individuals, most of whom were part of one of the 87 campus-based teams. The Forum has also published 3 monographs and numerous articles in *Change* and the *AAHE Bulletin*. Two of the lines of work we've pursued have become full-blown, independently funded projects which now work in association with the Forum: "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" and "New Pathways: Faculty Careers for the 21st Century."

The Forum has led the way in addressing the multiplicity of issues surrounding faculty roles and rewards and, thanks to a second three-year grant from FIPSE, will broaden its reach to include additional types of institutions. Simultaneously, the Forum will deepen its work by going to the departments and the disciplinary associations in an effort to have a more direct and concrete impact on institutional practices and faculty culture.

B. Purpose:

To provide status, direction, and practical guidance for campuses interested in reexamining the faculty's role in teaching, research, and service, AAHE proposed to frame and articulate an agenda; enable hundreds of education leaders to engage and shape this agenda at three annual national conferences; and pursue lines of work that would reach hundreds more through a clearinghouse for sharing information and publications. The Forum's role would be to provide an infrastructure for the discussions which were already taking place. We strove to organize these conversations around fresh formulations of the evolving problems and to reframe the way people think about faculty work.

C. Background & Origins:

When the Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards was proposed, faculty work issues were increasingly prevalent. AAHE had helped to put them there, through the activities of the Teaching Initiative and National Conference programs. We hoped to provide a way for colleagues working on roles and rewards related issues to come together and work through the various challenges we all faced, to provide intellectual capital which would advance their work, to create a process for change on campus (through our encouragement of campus-based teams), and to provide some practical tools with which these changes could be made.

With these goals and issues in mind, we identified three specific, interrelated problems to be addressed during the three year grant period. The first was the dominance of a single powerful definition of what roles and activities were worthy of faculty time and energy; there was still a

hierarchy among faculty priorities, with research at the top. This one-dimensional, hierarchical idea of professional worth was inappropriate for the diverse talents of contemporary faculty, for the changes that faculty experience over their professional lives, for the diverse missions of our colleges and universities, and for the changing needs of the various publics higher education serves. Our second challenge was that faculties had no developed mechanisms for assuring the quality with which their work tasks -- all of them -- are performed. In the case of teaching and service, most campuses had little, if any, faculty peer review process in these areas. Finally, academia faced an increasing movement towards bureaucratic forms of accountability imposed from outside. And it was imperative that higher education itself take the lead in working through what those outside academe might call the "productivity agenda." These problems added up, we believed, to missed opportunities and real losses for those who would benefit from the best work of our faculties. At stake was the faculty contribution to problems beyond the campus and, on campus, attention to matters of curriculum, teaching, and assessment.

D. Project Description:

AAHE proposed to create a Forum that was both a major event -- an annual national conference -- and a year-round program of activity: pursuing various lines of work, convening colleagues, and issuing publications. The most important first step was to frame the discussion about new priorities for faculty work in a way that would not be seen to threaten the sense of autonomy so central to scholarly life. We wanted to emphasize the possibility of liberation from an academic culture that faculty acknowledged as too rigid; rethinking faculty roles and rewards could free faculty to be better citizens of their institutions and larger communities. AAHE itself would not be the source of much of the substantive matter of the conversation (which would come from the campuses), but would serve as instigator of discussion, convener of occasions, and supporter of institutional efforts to work through the issues which had become so prevalent.

Specifically, we identified ongoing conversations in which we could play a meaningful role. In the work being done on rebalancing faculty's professorial roles (teaching, research and service), we hoped to bring the roles faculty perform as scholars into the mix, encouraging consideration of how faculty as scholars assign meaning and value to these tasks. This twofold consideration would focus attention on not only the extrinsic rewards (job standing, pay, etc.) but also on the intrinsic rewards that shape faculty priorities. Additionally, we hoped to make visible some professorial tasks, like teaching and professional practices, thus making them available for evaluation by communities that "count" -- including the community of one's peers. Our role in these lines of work would come through work with scholarly societies, convenings of thoughtful colleagues, publications, and the national conferences, at which we would bring together faculty, administrators, legislators, funders, and others doing good work on issues related to faculty roles and rewards.

E. Evaluation/Project Results:

The heart of the Forum has been its annual national conference. Attendance and participation in each conference exceeded our expectations: the first conference drew 564 participants from 42 states; the second included 634 attendees; and the third had 858 in attendance. Team participation has increased each year as well. More striking than the growth in number and size was the change in the quality of the discussion, the questions asked, and the willingness to deal

with change. The Forum has had a special impact on a number of universities and state systems, as evidenced by the participants sent to the conferences from those institutions and their involvement in initiating sessions and participating in other Forum programs.

The Forum's clearinghouse now includes 158 campus documents from 39 states as well as hundreds of articles from various journals, newspapers and magazines. There have been over 800 requests for information from the clearinghouse. An additional, unanticipated function has been the Forum staff's work as "connection makers" helping campus leaders to plan local events and to get in touch with colleagues doing similar, thoughtful work on other campuses.

Finally, the lines of work the Forum has pursued have resulted in three monographs, numerous articles in *Change* and the *AAHE Bulletin* and, in two cases, new projects. "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" was launched at the second Forum conference and is now entering a second phase, funded by the Pew and Hewlett Foundations. In conjunction with the Forum, this project works with pilot campuses in encouraging the addition of peer review to the evaluation of teaching. A second project "New Pathways: Faculty Careers for the 21st Century" operates under the auspices of the Forum; the focus of this project is reexamining tenure as process and policy, reconsidering the faculty career, and examining alternative employment arrangements.

The Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards could not have been launched at a better time. New external pressures focusing on issues of faculty priorities gave a sense of urgency to the work, energetic provosts prepared to provide critical leadership were ready to move ahead, and, most important, there were fresh ideas capable of eliciting a genuine "aha" response.

F. Summary & Conclusions:

AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards has come to the end of its third year and has succeeded far beyond original projections. The focus on reexamining faculty priorities and the reward structure has resonated broadly across higher education. The Forum's national conference has not only become a nexus where enabling connections are made among institutions and campus leaders, but has come to function as an incubator for new ideas and prototypes for innovative practice. It is not too much to say that the work of the Forum has evolved into a significant catalyst for change at a time when it is most needed.

Although it sounds a bit self-serving, it is clear that the development of new ideas and practices related to faculty work needs to be affiliated with and housed in established institutions. Initiatives in this area are already precarious and fragile. The participation of major universities in the work of the Forum, the contributions of Carnegie, Pew, and Hewlett, and -- above all --the generous support of FIPSE have made the achievements of this project possible. We at AAHE are especially grateful to FIPSE and its able staff.

A. Project Overview:

The Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards grew from AAHE's belief that circumstances and fresh ideas had converged, as we applied for our first FIPSE grant in 1991, to create an unprecedented opportunity to change the way faculty work -- an opportunity to legitimate a conception of scholarly life and modes of assessing and rewarding scholarly performance that would enable faculty more fully to embrace FIPSE's agenda for better teaching and learning.

In providing new status, direction, and practical guidance for campuses interested in striving to realign faculty priorities with primary institutional missions, AAHE proposed to frame an agenda and establish an infrastructure that would enable faculty and administrative leaders from across the country to constructively address these faculty-related issues. We proposed that this be accomplished by: (1) convening three annual national conferences; (2) pursuing lines of work that would reach hundreds more through targeted publications; and (3) by means of a clearinghouse for sharing campus-based documents addressing, in concrete ways, the faculty roles and rewards agenda.

When the initial proposal to FIPSE was written, we knew that the time was ripe for addressing issues related to the faculty role and the reward system. Recent developments in higher education and heightened public concern had forced these issues into the limelight and set the stage for their serious reconsideration. Little did we know just how intense the interest in this project would be, and how the concern with the faculty roles and rewards agenda would escalate over the span of the grant. The initial proposal is included in the appendices to this report.

By the end of the first year, the Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards had attracted national attention and was receiving daily assurances from the field of its timeliness and importance. Forum staff members were (and are) constantly called upon to speak to and consult with higher education organizations, state systems, individual institutions, boards of regents, scholarly societies and other concerned groups wishing to take advantage of what has been learned during the course of the project. The major problem was, and continues to be, keeping up with the steady stream of inquiries, requests for information and assistance, ideas for additional lines of work, and opportunities for collaboration with other projects. Inquiries, requests, and ideas continue to come in from AAHE members and others on campuses across the nation, from state higher education officers and legislative staff, and from the media. We are constantly striving to avoid what the current Forum Advisory Panel Chair David K. Scott (chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst) refers to as "programmatic drift," working to focus on those issues and efforts for which AAHE and the Forum can provide a unique perspective and expertise.

During the first year, AAHE began building networks and intellectual capital for the Forum, drawing particularly on "fugitive" documents collected and contacts made through a 1992 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching survey. The clearinghouse of campus documents has continued to grow (aided, in part, by another Carnegie survey in 1994), as has the Forum's library of articles and reports on issues related to the roles and rewards agenda.

Currently, the clearinghouse includes 158 campus documents from 39 states as well as several hundred articles gathered from newspapers, journals, and magazines. Over 800 interested parties have received the "Master List of Campus Documents" and/or the various bibliographies, for which requests still come in almost daily.

The first annual Conference on Faculty Roles & Rewards (held January 29-31, 1993 in San Antonio, TX) was planned for 350 participants. 556 campus leaders (including 62 teams of faculty and academic administrators) from 42 states and the District of Columbia actually attended; only limited hotel space prevented another several hundred registrants from taking part in this event. Successive conferences also exceeded attendance projections, with participation in the 1995 conference (held in Phoenix, AZ) reaching 858 individuals, most of whom were part of one of the 87 teams which took part. The constant increase in the conferences' size and the continuing and growing participation of campus teams is an indicator of the Forum's special impact on universities and colleges and state higher education systems. Over twenty such institutions have sent sizable teams to at least one of the Forum conferences; fourteen sent teams to each of the three meetings. Copies of the conference programs appear in the appendices to this report.

In addition to organizing annual conferences and serving as a clearinghouse, the Forum also set out to provide campuses with tools for change. FIPSE provided limited resources -- "seed money" -- for convenings and publications in two areas: using portfolios in the evaluation of teaching and developing an inventory of new modes of department-level assessment. The first of these efforts evolved into a major project -- "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" -- which was launched at the Forum's second conference in New Orleans. Twelve universities participated in the first phase of this project, which is beginning its second phase, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The Peer Review Project has published a "Project Workbook," a menu of strategies for peer review (forthcoming), and several monographs. A description of the Peer Review Project's second phase is included in this report's appendices.

The other lines of work on which we have focused attention -- departmental responsibilities and rewards; rethinking professional service; and broadening the definition of scholarship -- have not been developed as fully as the Peer Review project, but each has resulted in a monograph for the Forum's publication series. The first is Jon Wergin's *The Collaborative Department* (AAHE, 1994); the second, Ernest Lynton's *Making the Case for Professional Service* (AAHE, 1995); and the third, *The Disciplines Speak*, which was edited by Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam (AAHE, 1995). Each of these publications has been available for sale at AAHE's various conferences; they have also been distributed to participants in related workshops at Forum conferences. Copies of these publications can be found in the appendices to this report.

The success the Forum has enjoyed in reaching the goals outlined in the initial grant proposal is perhaps best exemplified in how much we now realize there is yet to do. AAHE's recently initiated project "New Pathways: Faculty Careers for the 21st Century," which works under the Forum's auspices, is taking on the tough task of examining the future of the professoriate.

Faculty members still struggle with balancing their various roles and with assuring the quality with which each of these roles is performed. Political change and public pressures over the grant's three years have led to the increasing role of bureaucratic forms of accountability, particularly related to faculty workloads and productivity, with which higher education must deal. The Forum has led the way in addressing these ever-changing, ever-multiplying issues, and, thanks to a second three-year grant from FIPSE, will broaden its reach to include additional types of institutions ("New American Colleges," former liberal arts colleges with newly diversified missions, and professional schools). Simultaneously, the Forum will deepen its work by going to the departments and the disciplinary associations in an effort to have a more direct and concrete impact on institutional practices and faculty culture.

B. Purpose:

As AAHE made its initial proposal to FIPSE, we realized that college and university faculty are the key actors in most of the improvements called for in the FIPSE guidelines. But, as was stated in that proposal:

> ...whether faculty will take action on the agendas outlined depends in large measure on whether the tasks required to realize improvements are valued and rewarded by their colleagues on campus and across the nation. The source of many obstacles to improvement, and the wellspring of new energy for it, lies in faculty understandings about what tasks are worth doing and how the quality with which these tasks are performed is viewed and rewarded.

The Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards was designed to reexamine and change the ways faculty work. The Forum hoped to provide campuses interested in reexamining the faculty's role in teaching, research and service with assistance in the form of new status, direction, and practical guidance for their work. To reach these goals, we would frame and articulate an agenda; gather educational leaders to engage and shape this agenda in national conferences; and pursue lines of work to reach hundreds more with further information and publications.

Since the submission of the original proposal, many of these issues have been reconfigured due to changes in society and within higher education. The landscape of public expectations, for instance, has changed and the pressures discussed in the initial proposal have intensified. Many factors -- continued demands for access to college, declining resources, and the quality revolution in all sectors -- have generated new public demands for responsiveness, productivity, and accountability. Institutions face increased pressure to improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and to address the needs of local communities and the larger society. Given these demands, academic leaders feel compelled to reexamine certain well-known dilemmas of academic life: the dominance of a one-dimensional, hierarchical ideal of scholarly worth, rooted in the prestige of scientific research; the absence of adequate ways to evaluate teaching and service, and the inadequacy of rewards for those functions, commensurate with the rewards for research.

These are all familiar problems within higher education: what the Forum has successfully done -- even as the pressures intensified -- is organize the conversation around fresh formulations of these evolving problems and reframe the way people think about faculty work. We now realize that, in order to continue to impact the way people think about these issues, we must broaden the Forum's reach to encompass a wider range of institutions, professional associations, and newly formed consortia, all of whom are grappling with faculty issues and their relationship to primary institutional missions, especially teaching and service to the community. We need to deepen our work with institutions and professional associations, aiming programmatic initiatives at department-level concerns, thus working more directly with faculty.

Administratively, our biggest realization has been that our original expectations of public and academic interest in these issues was remarkably conservative; from the project's beginnings we have been (happily) flooded with inquiries, requests and ideas. Our conferences have been consistently larger than projected, and we are constantly asked to become partners in the various roles and rewards related initiatives that are being undertaken across the country.

The work of the first three years of the Forum has allowed us to come to these realizations about and redefinitions of our original purpose and to deal with the overwhelming interest in our work. The second phase will enable us to move from fresh ideas to new practice.

C. Background & Origins:

We proposed the Forum knowing that faculty roles and rewards issues were more and more in the air. AAHE had helped put them there, through the activities of the Teaching Initiative and National Conference programs focused (in 1990, for instance) on "Today's Choices, Tomorrow's Faculty." We hoped, through the Forum, to provide an infrastructure which would allow those colleagues working on roles and rewards related issues to come together and work through the various challenges we all faced, to produce intellectual capital which would advance their work, to create a process for change on campus (through our encouragement of campus-based teams), and to provide some practical tools with which these changes could be made With these goals and the prominence of these issues in mind, we identified three specific, interrelated problems to be addressed during the span of the grant.

The first of these problems was the dominance of a single, powerful definition -- the model of a professional researcher, drawn from the German university -- of what roles and activities were worthy of faculty time and energy. Though there were (and are) faculty and institutions that managed to escape the full force of this model, it was still clear that there was a hierarchy among faculty priorities, with research at the top. We were not proposing to devalue research, but to establish that the one-dimensional, hierarchical ideal of professional worth was simply too narrow and inappropriate for the diverse talents of contemporary faculty, for the changes that faculty experience over the courses of their professional lives, for the diverse missions of our colleges and universities, and for the changing needs of the various publics higher education serves.

The second problem was related to the first: our faculties have no developed mechanisms for

assuring the quality with which their work tasks -- all of them -- are performed. An important tradition of peer review has evolved in the case of research (though some feel that, with the advent of "publications counting" over thoughtful review, this has eroded). In the case of teaching and service, most campuses had little, if any, faculty peer-review process in these areas.

There was even more at stake in the third problem we hoped to address, for the alternative to professional accountability within academia is bureaucratic forms of control imposed from outside. At the time our proposal was submitted, new forms of intrusion were beginning to appear: legislation had been proposed in several states to regulate faculty workload; others were considering mandates for testing TA's; still others were turning toward more rigid, scorekeeping requirements for student assessment.. These developments threatened gradually to erode the qualities of academic work that initially attract talented faculty to academia. It was imperative that higher education itself take the lead in working through what those outside academe might call the "productivity agenda."

These three problems -- a too-narrow model of scholarship, the absence of peer review and quality-assurance mechanisms, and the prospect of externally imposed, bureaucratic forms of accountability -- added up, we believed, to missed opportunities and real losses for those who would benefit from the best work of our faculties. At stake was the faculty contribution to problems beyond the campus -- school reform and social problem solving, for instance -- and, on campus, attention to matters of curriculum, teaching, and assessment.

The problems we outlined were not new, but circumstances at the time, both outside and inside higher education, made for a particular sense of urgency about tackling them. Higher education faced a decrease in the various revenue sources it had come to count on. Serious financial restraints prompted more and harder questions from our external publics about needs, costs, and quality. And as resources for some tasks diminished or were shifted to new areas, faculty themselves began to search for new scholarly endeavors. There was a growing insistence on the part of external publics for attention to quality and increased productivity. The business community's focus on "restructuring" and "total quality management" was moving into higher education. Pressures were increasing to assure that faculty were engaged in what the public thought it was paying for -- high-quality teaching and professional service. The erosion of public trust in higher education further complicated the situation; media attention to higher education was skyrocketing, and almost all of it was negative. Faculty were widely viewed, within and without academe, as caught up in their own private pursuits to the neglect of their students and the needs of the larger community.

Our point was not that these perceptions were valid, but that they existed and -- importantly for the activities our proposal included -- that campuses were beginning to see that they must be dealt with. Campus leaders were recognizing that higher education would have to work hard in coming years to be socially responsive -- in appearance and in fact. These external conditions established a context that gave a sense of urgency to the Forum, but there was a condition within academe that also made the project right for its time: the aging of the faculty generation that came to higher education in the 1950's and 1960's. While many reports focused on the

"changing of the guard" and coming supply shortages, much less attention had been paid to opportunities implicit in these demographics. First, in many institutions, there were talented senior faculty who were at a stage in their professional careers where they were eager to broaden their scholarly pursuits into new engagements (i.e., working with public schoolteachers). Second, the fact that a whole new generation of faculty was coming on line in the next ten to fifteen years meant that -- if we could redefine the expectations and rewards for faculty work -- our impact would be enormous. An opportunity to shape the 21st century professoriate was at hand.

While the conditions surrounding the original Forum proposal were new, the problems had been with us for years. But for the first time, circumstances had converged to create a ripe moment for addressing these problems; questions of the faculty role and, therefore, of the reward system, were suddenly, visibly, on the national agenda. Over the two years preceding the proposal, four initiatives stood out as "signs of the times" in this regard. At Stanford and Syracuse new initiatives were begun to focus on redressing the balance between research and (especially undergraduate) teaching. The survey which led to the Syracuse initiative was replicated during the 1990 academic year at 47 research universities; each one was in favor of redressing the balance and further emphasizing teaching.

On several other fronts, concern was mounting about the service agenda, and the needs for applied research; Harvard President Derek Bok consistently articulated these needs in lectures, books and addresses to the University. Academic leaders at urban universities began to look to the urban affairs division of NASULGC (the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges) for attention to the rewards system aspects of the land-grant service mission. Publications were commissioned on the topic; Susan Smock and Sandra Elman's widely-used booklet *Professional Service and Faculty Rewards* was followed by a fuller argument, written by Ernest Lynton and Sandra Elman, *New Priorities for the University*.

Most influential, though, was the work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. From 1988-1990, current Forum director R. Eugene Rice was in residence at the Carnegie Foundation working with President Ernest Boyer on a study arguing that the kind of scholarship needed in contemporary society engages faculty in four overlapping roles: advancing knowledge; synthesizing and integrating knowledge; applying knowledge; and representing knowledge through teaching. This work led to the publication of a "special report" entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Suddenly, *Scholarship Reconsidered* was everywhere -- reviewed in campus publications, featured in lectures and keynotes, and catalyzing campus efforts to reprioritize.

AAHE hoped to take advantage of the heightened attention to issues of faculty roles and rewards and in the new conception of scholarship which Boyer's and Rice's work had brought to the fore; we hoped to nurture the interest and enthusiasm, supporting and giving direction to the newly initiated projects. Campus leaders, we felt, needed the encouragement of a national association that could create forums for collaborative work and help in developing a "second generation" of methods for reviewing the quality with which faculty roles were being performed. The Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards was proposed to provide the infrastructure needed to foster these

new initiatives.

Project Description:

To take advantage of the uniquely apt moment described above, AAHE proposed to create a Forum that was both a major event -- an annual national conference -- and a year-round program of activity: pursuing various lines of work, convening colleagues, and issuing publications. All these activities were, of course, a means to get somewhere, so it was important to decide where it was we thought the national conversation about faculty roles and rewards should go.

Based on AAHE's experience with a previous, analogous FIPSE-supported venture -- the AAHE Assessment Forum -- and information supplied by some of the initiatives which had been recently begun, we realized that the most important first step was to frame the discussion about new priorities for faculty work in a way that would not engender hostility and resistance, being seen to threaten the sense of autonomy so central to scholarly life. Instead, we wanted to emphasize the possibility of liberation from an academic culture that faculty acknowledged as too rigid; rethinking faculty roles and rewards could free faculty to be better citizens of their institutions and larger communities. Though we had an idea of how this rethinking might take shape, we realized that AAHE itself would not be the source of much of the substantive matter of the conversation -- the real awareness of these issues was on campuses -- but we could serve as instigator of discussion, convener of occasions, and supporter of institution-based efforts to work through the issues which had become so prevalent.

In our effort to fulfill the role we'd laid out for ourselves, we identified several substantive areas where we hoped to encourage meaningful discussion and activity. The first of these came from our enthusiasm for the new horizons *Scholarship Reconsidered* outlined. As faculty, administrators and institutions across the nation struggled, in the wake of *Scholarship Reconsidered*, to redress the balance within the familiar trilogy of teaching, research, and service, we hoped to encourage a consideration of the interaction between faculty as professors (the role described by the traditional trilogy) and faculty as scholars (members of a particular scholarly community). The movement towards rebalancing teaching, research, and service dealt only with faculty as professors, as employees of a particular institution. We hoped to encourage additional consideration of how faculty, as scholars, assign meaning and value to these tasks; this twofold consideration would focus attention on not only the extrinsic rewards (job standing, pay, etc.) but also on the intrinsic rewards that shape faculty priorities. The Forum was designed to focus attention on the crossroads where the obligations of faculty as scholars and the obligations of faculty as professors come together.

This awareness of the importance of the scholarly community and its unfortunate disconnection from the professorial role led to the second area in which we hoped to encourage conversation. Some professorial tasks, like teaching and professional practice, were largely invisible; ways of documenting and displaying these tasks had to be developed so that they could become public and subject to review. Once visible, evaluation of these tasks must be done by the communities that "count" -- including the community of one's peers. Not just research, but all forms of

faculty work we hoped to deem "scholarly" should be peer reviewed. The fact that these invisible parts of the faculty roles were not peer reviewed laid in the prevailing views about what "real" scholarship as research was all about, views that were based on conceptions of what kinds of knowledge are most worth possessing. The dominant but too-narrow definition of scholarship which contributed to our initial desire to pursue this line of work valued scientific-style inquiry and knowledge above the sort of knowing that is entailed in communicating and representing ideas. The "situational knowing" that distinguishes expert practitioners was hardly recognized at all. Yet it was precisely these undervalued, underrecognized sorts of knowledge and ways of knowing that were at stake in discerning the quality with which tasks such as applied research, teaching, and professional practice were performed. Good work was being done on this issue -- Lee Shulman's work on "the knowing" in teaching and Donald Schön's on the "reflective practitioner" were two noteworthy examples -- and conversations on whether and how to give greater recognition to new kinds of knowledge were taking place in many disciplines. What remained to be done, and could be done through the Forum, was to connect these various conversations to the campus-driven reexamination of faculty roles and rewards that had begun.

To effectively encourage the sort of discussions our substantive concerns required, we planned to work with the scholarly societies, particularly by seeking "official representation" from the societies at our national conferences. More important, though, was the participation of the key academic leaders (including provosts) who would set the agenda for change on campuses across the country. And absolutely vital to our efforts was the participation of those department leaders and faculty who were "down in the pit" -- within each particular academic unit -- where campus policies on matters such as appointment, promotion, and tenure get applied, in real cases. It is within the departments where the obligations of the faculty member as scholar and as professor would be brought together; academic departments were at the main crossroads and engaging them in our project was of the utmost importance. The Forum, through all its activities, but most visibly through the national conference, would shape the national conversation; AAHE's distinctive trademark as an association is that we are focused not on political advocacy but intellectual leadership -- we believe in the subtle power of perspective and language.

The hub at which our substantive concerns, campus-based efforts, and diverse participants would converge was to be our annual national conferences. AAHE had run a number of national conferences over the years and knew a lot about the power of such an event to provide a focus and a sense of momentum for work on important issues; we believed that an annual national conference was the best and most cost-effective vehicle for providing status, direction, and practical guidance to the burgeoning interest in faculty roles and rewards. Status came from the fact of the event itself -- a recurring, annual conference -- and from those who would come to be involved in it. Our programs have featured the efforts of individuals doing the very best, most thoughtful work on these issues. The message has been that respected colleagues are moving ahead on these issues -- and that the time has come for others to do so as well. The conference provided direction to the conversation about faculty roles and rewards by representing the various vantage points (public accountability, aligning workload with campus mission, faculty members' own careers, etc.) from which the agenda is posed and the issues are framed and discussed. Our third -- and perhaps most important -- purpose of providing practical guidance was served

through the conferences as they allowed campuses to progress together on the roles and rewards agenda. Participants brought to the conferences useful tools and materials -- statements of rationale, guidelines, cases, inventories, surveys, protocols, profiles, portfolios -- that prompted and enabled other campuses to try out new ways to do things and to learn from the experiences of others who had previously worked with them.

In our marketing efforts and program design, we pitched the conference, first of all, to the academic affairs leadership (particularly the chief academic officer and the leader of the faculty governance mechanism) of campuses with complex missions -- missions embracing teaching, research and service. All types of institutions were welcome, but we clearly stated that our "center of gravity" was those campuses whose faculty are expected to engage in multiple roles. Academic affairs leaders were strongly encouraged to lead or send campus teams; teams can share ideas, reinforce commitments, and, back on campus, build momentum for translating ideas into action. The teams would, ideally, be led by a campus leader and filled out with those members of the faculty (the promotion/tenure committee chair, the chair of a pilot department, a key opinion leader) who would most profit from the conferences' programs. Additionally, we'd make every possible effort -- by working both with academic leaders who could sponsor them and also with the scholarly societies -- to involve faculty active in, and spokespersons for, their scholarly societies. Finally, we intended to bring to the conference representatives from state government, national agencies such as the NSF, private foundations, accrediting agencies, and other important external sources of incentives and rewards. Each of these sets of constituencies would bring important perspectives, bodies of knowledge, and experiences to the conversation we hoped would take place at and continue after the conferences.

The conferences' programs were, of course, as prominent in our planning as were the audiences we hoped to attract. With the advice of those doing good work in the field, each year's program dealt with all three categories of issues -- redefining and restating expectations for faculty work, evaluating faculty work, and providing rewards and incentives for faculty work. But during the course of the three years, we shifted the programs' focus from expectations to evaluations to rewards and incentives, so as to work through each of these areas in depth. The first conference focussed on "The New American Scholar," and we (with Ernest Boyer's and Gene Rice's help) delved deeply into the ways leading scholars see their disciplines and professions, and their roles within them, and what these role definitions imply for their work as professors. The conferences were structured so as to accommodate both those who wished to "work through" issues of policy with respected colleagues and those who wanted a wide menu of carefully prepared sessions providing both perspective and hands-on guidance. Our initial model had the conference beginning over a weekend with small seminars on policy and workshops (for practical guidance), then moving into a more traditional format of general and regular sessions.

Though the primary reasons for the conferences were to advance the Forum's agenda and convene groups of thoughtful colleagues, we also hoped that they would help to pay their own way and generate revenue that would offset the overall costs of the Forum. In planning for the three annual conferences, we foresaw several possible scenarios -- in the first, the Forum becomes a place where academic affairs minded campus leaders gather and/or sponsor teams.

This scenario, we felt, would yield 250-350 participants. The second scenario had external constituencies continuing to sharpen the pressures on faculty productivity issues as issues of faculty policy heat up internally; or interest in certain lines of work that genuinely make sense and appeal to faculty would take off. In either of these cases, attendance might, we felt, easily double to 500-700 registrants.

Given these scenarios and AAHE's past experience with conference planning, we found it reasonable to assume that paid attendance would be 350 in 1993, 400 in 1994 and 450 in 1995; registration fees would be approximately $225 in 1993, $240 in 1994, and $255 in 1995. Each of these fees would be reduced by $50 for each individual who attended a conference as a member of a team (a group of three or more from any single campus); we assumed that approximately 2/3 of the registrants each year would be members of a team. We figured that 1993's conference would generate a registration income of $66,750 (based on 80 three-member campus teams, 100 individual attendees); 1994 would generate $82,750 (400 paid attendees, 2/3 as team members); and 1995 would see income of $99,750 (450 paid attendees, again, 2/3 as team members). The total revenue over the three years, we estimated, would be $249,250, all of which would be used to offset expenses we would otherwise have to request from FIPSE. We were confident enough about the need for and interest in the national conferences that we planned to assume a substantial level of risk: if registration fee income fell below our projections, we would draw on AAHE's own general funds to make up any resulting shortfall.

But the Forum was much more than a national conference; the conferences served to make other equally important activities and lines of work possible, track those lines of work, and provide visibility to resulting, promising, developments. We stimulated the most promising lines of work in various -- through small convenings, campus demonstration projects, networking activities, publications, and, of course, conference sessions. At the outset, we proposed ten lines of work, several in each of three areas: reframing faculty expectations, evaluating performance, and designing rewards and incentives. Of these, two -- using portfolios to evaluate teaching and exploring new modes of departmental review through an inventory of protocols and profiles -- were presented for FIPSE funding (the others, we hoped, could be pursued through funding our activities would attract). Our role was to serve as a central colleague and cheerleader to the trailbreakers in the field; we often consulted with those in the field who were writing policies and instituting practices.

In other areas, we've taken the lead, organizing activities, clarifying issues, authoring publications that led, in turn, to further activities. The three Forum monographs, *The Disciplines Speak*, *The Collaborative Department*, and *Making the Case for Professional Service*, represent some of the areas we've been most interested in; each of these is regularly the starting point for campus initiatives, conference workshops, and local seminars. The most prominent of these efforts is the Peer Review of Teaching Project, which grew out of our intention to encourage the use of portfolios in evaluating teaching. In cooperation with AAHE's Teaching Initiative, we worked to bring this agenda to the attention of interested parties -- 12 pilot campuses signed on to be part of initial efforts in this area. The Peer Review project has published several monographs, a handbook and (forthcoming) a menu of strategies; it is now entering its second phase of work,

funded by the Hewlett and Pew foundations. Similarly, our work on redefining faculty career paths and considering alternatives to traditional tenure systems has grown into a project entitled "New Pathways: Faculty Careers for the 21st Century." This project is attracting a lot of attention and will be publishing a series of fourteen working papers -- focusing on such topics as post-tenure review, full-time non-tenure track faculty appointments; faculty retirement -- over the next year. (A list of these publications, with brief descriptions, is included in the appendices to this report, as are copies of the first two papers.)

To accomplish these diverse goals, project staff pursued a range of different but related activities. We analyzed issues, investigated and evaluated current activity, engaged campus practitioners nationwide, read and collected key documents, and, most of all, thought hard about future needs. As we've become knowledgeable about these issues, staff members have become key resources and are increasingly called upon to serve as speakers and consultants to those who are pursuing these issues on campus. We provide information services to interested parties, putting those with questions in touch with those who can best provide answers, or suggest next steps to colleagues at critical junctures. Our collection of roles and rewards related literature and the Forum's own publications have served as vital resources to our colleagues in the field.

Evaluation/Project Results:

In our original proposal to FIPSE, we planned to "routinely conduct the kind of evaluation that (a) will help us make mid-course corrections and (b) does not require a separate line item of expense." For the national conference, this has meant that we regularly collected information about the numbers and profiles of those who attend and that we have asked attendees to evaluate the conference. These efforts have resulted in impressions of, but not systematic evidence about, whether and how those attended made use of the experience back on their own home campuses.

The first conference, at which the Forum was unveiled, was planned for 350 participants who would meet in San Antonio. 556 campus leaders from 42 states and the District of Columbia actually attended, including nationally known senior scholars like Lee Shulman of Stanford University, faculty leaders, and chief academic officers and deans from public and private universities. Several hundred potential registrants were turned away due to lack of meeting space at the hotel. This first conference attracted 62 teams made up of 314 of senior faculty and academic administrators. Participants at this conference asked, in their evaluation forms, for more sessions focused on particular issues and "hands on" learning -- more workshops, more concurrent sessions, more consulting lunches, team meetings, etc.

Based on the popularity of the first year's event, we planned for up to 700 attendees at the second conference in New Orleans. 623 participants were in attendance, and the figure would have been even higher but for an untimely blizzard. 292 of these participants, representing 85 campuses, attended as team members. The program at this conference was adjusted in accordance with the feedback we received from the San Antonio meeting; evaluations revealed that these changes were, generally, very well received. Unfortunately -- except for the opening keynote -- the plenary sessions were not as successful as hoped and, as a result, the conference

didn't "come together" for the participants as had the previous year's event.

The third conference, held in Phoenix, drew 858 participants, including 87 campus teams. Again, we provided ample workshops, general sessions and opportunities for participants to network, a conference function which, evaluations were showing, was vital to those in attendance. Over the course of the three conferences, we've built a growing group of "regulars" -- 140 attendees came in both 1993 and 1994; 102 attended both 1993 and 1995; and 154 attended both 1994 and 1995. 64 loyal participants have attended all three events. (See Table I.)

Table I: AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards
Conference Attendance Patterns
1993 (San Antonio), 1994 (New Orleans), 1995 (Phoenix)

	1993	1994	1995
Number of participants	564	636	858
Number of teams	48	74	87
Number of repeat attendees (64 have been to all 3)	--	140	102(1993) 154(1994)

Clearly, the conference was reaching out to individual members of the academic community and our figures on institutional participation imply that we've made an impact on them as well. 14 institutions or systems (Arizona State University, Miami University, Michigan State University, Syracuse University, University of Nebraska System, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, Kent State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Northeastern University, Pennsylvania State University, Stanford University, University of Cincinnati, University of North Dakota, and the University of North Texas) have a sent a team to all three conferences. Twelve institutions or systems have sent large teams to at least one of the meetings (California State University System - 48, Arizona State University - 42, University of Wisconsin System - 41, Northern Arizona University - 35, Miami University - 29, Michigan State University - 27, Syracuse University - 26, University of Nebraska System - 25, University of Arkansas - 24, University of Houston System - 24, University of Massachusetts System - 24, and the University of Texas - 24). (See Table II.)

Our efforts in other areas have been similarly well-received. The three Forum monographs continue to serve as useful resources for colleagues interested in pursuing the redefinition of faculty roles. The *Change* and *AAHE Bulletin* articles are frequently requested resources, as are the various bibliographies we have compiled (a recent American Association of Medical Colleges conference, for instance, featured a resource notebook based almost entirely on one of these documents). Requests for resources, speakers, and general information come in daily via phone, fax, email and written requests; Forum staff estimates that over 800 such requests were handled over the course of the three year grant. The clearinghouse and publications aspects of the Forum are, as we'd hoped, providing practical tools and guidance to campuses wrestling with issues of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

faculty work.

Table II: Institutional Participation, 1993-1995

Institution	# Participants
California State University System	48
*Arizona State University	42
University of Wisconsin System	41
Northern Arizona University	35
*Miami University (OH)	29
*Michigan State University	27
*Syracuse University	26
*University of Nebraska System	25
University of Arkansas	24
University of Houston System	24
University of Massachusetts System	24
University of Texas	24

Other institutions which have participated all three years are Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, Kent State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Northeastern University, Pennsylvania State University, Stanford University, University of Cincinnati, University of North Dakota and the University of North Texas.

*Schools that have sent a team all three years.

Though these are all positive signs that the work of the Forum is being taken seriously, what is both harder to track and, ultimately, more interesting, is our larger, more substantive impact on the roles and rewards conversation. Careful consideration of new initiatives launched since the Forum began provides clues as to our influence in stimulating thinking, writing, and campus action around faculty roles and rewards. Some systems or institutions have, since the start of the Forum, begun holding their own local meetings on faculty roles and rewards -- a prime example is the University of Wisconsin's now-annual meeting. We have impacted other institutions' planning processes, for instance, the University System of Georgia recently created a systemwide task force to conduct a year-long study on faculty/staff development, including personnel policies. The task force's recommendations were reported at a session held during the Forum's Fourth Annual Conference, held last January in Atlanta. The ongoing work at Syracuse University's Center for Instructional Development has also been closely allied with the work of the Forum and our annual conference has been the primary vehicle for the dissemination of their important institutional surveys on faculty priorities.

The Forum has effected the initiatives and conference programs of a number of disciplinary associations, including the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, the American Association of Medical Colleges, and the Council of Independent Colleges (which recently received a grant from Pew to study roles and rewards issues among its constituents). Other associations, including those related to accounting, sociology, religious studies, pharmacy, history, and communications, as well as the Association of Governing Boards and SHEEO, have drawn on the Forum's resources in preparing policies and meeting agendas. Forum and AAHE staff members are involved with work being done by the National Education Association and with discussions surrounding the future of accreditation and the accrediting of innovative programs. We have worked with state faculty senates, the Carnegie, Pew and Kettering Foundations, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the Pew Roundtable as they've pursued inquiries related to the future of faculty work. All of these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

relationships have provided us with opportunities to facilitate the roles and rewards conversations taking place across the country and to help the various organizations pursuing such inquiries to collaborate in redefining the future of faculty work.

F. Summary and Conclusions:

AAHE's Forum on Faculty Roles & Rewards has come to the end of its third year and has succeeded far beyond what was originally projected. The focus on reexamining faculty priorities and the reward structure has resonated broadly across higher education. The Forum's national conference has not only become a nexus where enabling connections are made among institutions and campus leaders, but has come to function as an incubator for new ideas and prototypes for innovative practice. It is not too much to say that the work of the Forum has evolved into a significant catalyst for change at a time when it is most needed.

In FIPSE's final report guidelines, you asked for insights gained in the process of "doing" the project. Particularly striking is the power of the campus-based "teams" approach we used in structuring participation in the annual conferences and related projects. In the process of using this approach, we discovered that in faculty-related projects it is an especially effective change strategy. Provosts used it to get faculty leaders to "buy into" change agendas that they would otherwise resist if they'd not been exposed (at the Forum conference) to faculty from other campuses where success with a specific strategy was being enthusiastically reported on and discussed.

We also discovered that encouraging provosts and deans to take seriously our work on faculty roles and rewards was not enough. Success in this endeavor requires that we move to where the faculty live and work -- to the departments and to the disciplines. Academic administrators see the logic of the Forum initiatives almost immediately; they have face validity for them. This is not true for many faculty who continue to believe that the changes we are confronting and trying to address through the Forum will soon pass, and colleges and universities will return to business-as-usual. The second Forum proposal to FIPSE gives working with departments and disciplinary associations high priority. The critical role that faculty chairs play in advancing the roles and rewards agenda is also given a more central place.

The significance of the Forum as a linking mechanism, although envisioned from the start, was an additional surprise. To have a central place where connections can be made and networks of key actors committed to an emerging task of importance can be established, has proven to be indispensable. A good example is the work being done on post-tenure review. This is an issue individual campuses have been struggling with in isolation for a dozen years. Only recently -- and primarily through the initiative of the Forum -- has this become a collaborative endeavor, where faculty and administrators learn from one another, share peer critique and support, and the agenda is advanced. An added benefit for a wide-range of projects dealing with faculty priorities and the rewards system is that they now have a place for focused dissemination.

In retrospect, the timing of the introduction of the Forum can be seen as particularly important.

The momentum that the work of the Forum has continued to gather -- best seen in the size of the 4th annual conference (over 1,000 participants, and more than 100 teams) -- has a lot to do with the initial timing of the project. It is imperative that we now move from generating new ideas to the development of concrete practice. This is essential in sustaining the momentum of the project and is also a matter of timing.

We have discovered that there are demands out there that the Forum, in its present configuration, can't meet. A whole new initiative could be shaped around the faculty roles and rewards issues being confronted by community colleges. We have made the judgement that for the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards to take on that agenda would be to spread ourselves too thin and undermine our effectiveness with four-year institutions. We have concluded, not that the concern for faculty priorities is an insignificant issue in community colleges, but that a separate program is needed.

Recently, we have begun to raise questions about the way in which the word "service" is used in reference to faculty work. Despite Ernest Lynton's gallant effort to address the issues related to definition in his Forum publication *Making a Case for Professional Service,* serious consideration is being given to dropping the service designation altogether. We need new language with which to discuss the work and rewards of the engaged faculty member, language that encompasses teaching and research, as well as what now falls under the rubric of service.

Although it sounds a bit self-serving, it is clear that the development of new ideas and practices related to faculty work needs to be affiliated with and housed in established institutions. Initiatives in this area are already precarious and fragile. The participation of major universities in the work of the Forum, the contributions of Carnegie, Pew, and Hewlett, and -- above all --the generous support of FIPSE have made the achievements of this project possible. We at AAHE are especially grateful to FIPSE and its able staff.

G. Appendices:

Enclosed with this report are the following related materials:

"AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards: Proposal to Fipse (Key Excerpts)"

Copies of the programs from the first three AAHE Conferences on Faculty Roles & Rewards

The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional and Creative Work of Faculty, Robert M. Diamond and Bronwyn E. Adam, eds. (AAHE, 1995)

Making the Case for Professional Service, Ernest Lynton (AAHE, 1995)

The Collaborative Department: How Five Campuses are Inching Toward Cultures of Collective Responsibility, Jon F. Wergin (AAHE, 1994)

"From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" project description

"New Pathways: Faculty Careers for the 21st Century" project description

"New Pathways Working Paper Series" description

Making a Place for the New American Scholar, R. Eugene Rice (AAHE, 1996)

Tenure Snapshot, Cathy A. Trower (AAHE, 1996)

"Master List of Campus Documents"

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

(Short Form)

(Follow instructions on the back)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned By Federal Agency	OMB Approval No.	Page	of
Department of Education FIPSE	P116B20191-92A	0348-0039	1	2 pages

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address, including ZIP code)

American Association for Higher Education,
One Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, DC 20036

4. Employer Identification Number	5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number	6. Final Report	7. Basis
52-0891675	1-520891675-A1	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Cash ☒ Accrual

8. Funding/Grant Period (See instructions) From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)	9. Period Covered by this Report From: (Month, Day, Year)	To: (Month, Day, Year)
8/5/92	1/31/96	8/5/94	1/31/96

10. Transactions:	I Previously Reported	II This Period	III Cumulative
a. Total outlays	369,373	195,383	564,756
b. Recipient share of outlays	0	0	0
c. Federal share of outlays	369,373	195,383	564,756
d. Total unliquidated obligations			0
e. Recipient share of unliquidated obligations			0
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations			0
g. Total Federal share *(Sum of lines c and f)*			564,756
h. Total Federal funds authorized for this funding period			564,756
i. Unobligated balance of Federal funds *(Line h minus line g)*			0

11. Indirect Expense	a. Type of Rate *(Place "X" in appropriate box)* N/A ☐ Provisional ☐ Predetermined ☐ Final ☐ Fixed			
	b. Rate	c. Base	d. Total Amount	e. Federal Share

12. *Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation.*

13. Certification: **I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unliquidated obligations are for the purposes set forth in the award documents.**

Typed or Printed Name and Title	Telephone (Area code, number and extension)
Kristin May, Asst. Director of Finance	(202) 293-6440 x12
Signature of Authorized Certifying Official	**Date Report Submitted**
Kristin May	4/24/96

Previous Editions not Usable

Standard Form 269A (REV 4-88)
Prescribed by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FORUM ON FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS Grant # P116B20191-92A

Budget Detail: August 5, 1994 thru January 31, 1996	YEAR 3 BUDGET	YEAR 3 ACTUAL	YEAR 3 VARIANCE
A. DIRECT COSTS			
1. Personnel	107,601	109,051	(1,450)
2. Fringe Benefits @ 22.5% (FICA/MEDICARE, 7.65%; Retirement, 7.0%; Medical and Dental, 7.0%; Life Insurance, LTD, .85%)	24,286	22,554	1,733
3. Staff Travel	2,200	1,873	327
4. Equipment			
5. Supplies			
a. Paper, disks, etc. @ $120 per month	1,100	1,352	(252)
b. Letterhead	900	1,000	(100)
6. Consultants or Contracts			
7. Other			
a. Professional society delegate travel/ registration fee subsidy	5,500	4,523	977
b. Conference planning group		895	(895)
c. Publications	8,307	13,659	(5,352)
d. Special convenings	3,213	3,603	(390)
e. Telephone	2,480	2,480	
f. Postage	1,984	1,984	
g. Photocopying	992	1,224	(232)
h. Delivery, shipping, (e.g. FEDEX, messengers, etc.)	496	334	162
i. Rent	10,352	10,352	
j. Teaching Portfolio Directory			
k. Teaching Portfolio Network			
l. "Best of Conference" Publications Collection	5,000		5,000
m. Occasional Papers	472		472
n. Special studies/policies analysis	20,500	20,500	
B. INDIRECT COSTS			
Total	195,383	195,383	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE